DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 743 HE 003 791

AUTHOR	Horowitz, Joseph L.; Sedlacek, William E.
TITLE	Freshmen Expectations of the University of Maryland, 1971-72.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
REPORT NO	RR-9-72
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Freshmen; *Higher Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

The present study had as its purpose to determine incoming freshmen expectations of the University of Maryland. Two models of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) were utilized in the study, and the data were analyzed to determine the relationship between CUES I and CUES II results, between 1969 and 1971 freshmen perceptions, and between the perceptions of freshmen entering different colleges of the university. Results of the study indicate that the two instruments seem to be measuring the same things, and incoming freshmen held the same expectations of the institution regardless of their intended college of enrollment. Large changes were recorded between 1969 and 1971 on all scales of CUES except scholarship. These changes were in the direction of significantly lower expectations and were more in line with perceptions of upperclassmen. Several new and emerging roles for student personnel workers seem possible and desirable. (HS)

ED 072743

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

HE003791

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072743

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

FRESHMEN EXPECTATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, 1971-72

Research Report #9-72

Joseph L. Horowitz and William E. Sedlacek

SUMMARY

Incoming freshmen responded to the College and University Environment Scales (CUES) during the 1971 freshman orientation program in terms of their expectations of the University of Maryland. A profile of expectations was discerned, using both CUES I (N=383) and CUES II (N=383). The data were analyzed to determine the relationship between CUES I and CUES II results, between 1969 and 1971 freshman perceptions, and between the perceptions of freshmen entering different colleges of the University.

Only on the Propriety scale did CUES II differ from CUES I, indicating that the two instruments seem to be measuring the same things. Incoming freshmen held the same expectations of the institution, regardless of their intended college of enrollment. Large changes were recorded between 1969 and 1971 on all scales of CUES except scholarship. These changes were in the direction of significantly lower expectations along the Propriety, Practicality, Awareness and Community dimensions, and were more in line with perceptions of upperclassmen.

Thus, at least at one school, the role of student personnel staff and programs in attempting to reduce the gap between perceptions and reality through orientation programs, counseling, student activities and related programs appears minimized. The mass media, through generally negative publicity about riots, financial problems, racial problems, etc., as well as friends and neighbors likely have shattered the image of ivy covered walls and studious discourse across a log.

Several new and emerging roles for student personnel workers seem possible and desirable. Rather than focusing on the borad aspects of what college life is all about, the focus can be on the diversity of life styles and specific orientation, counseling, and advisement within that context. In other words student personnel can move from a molar approach to a more molecular one. Second, it would seem

that more time could be spent in direct and indirect support of academic programs, the primary business of a university. Teaching, academic advising, structuring learning environments and programs, and focusing on classroom activities seem warranted. Third, a role discussed but not often implemented (O'Neil, 1972), is that of change agent. O'Neil found very few student personnel workers at the University engaged in such activity. That is, if the expectations and reality of the environment are in line, one might try to change the environment and hope to bring the perceptions along with the change. This will likely require much stronger and more radical positions, backed up by expertise, taken by student personnel workers. Change is difficult and requires intense and sustained efforts (Alinsky, 1971).

It is likely that most student personnel workers will require training in one or all of these areas. This can be accomplished through staff development on the job and through curriculum revision in graduate programs.

The idea that behavior is a function of the interaction between people and their world runs through both personality and social psychological theory. In viewing college students, their world or environment is the institution itself, and the perceptions students hold of their institution reflect, in some manner, the interaction between themselves and their environment. Henry Murray's "environmental press" concept functions as the basis for Pace's College and University Environment Scales (Pace, 1963). The College and University Scales (CUES) attempt to give a description of the college environment in terms of five scales: Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, and Scholarship (see Appendix). In 1969, Pace published a second edition of CUES (CUES II), which was similar to the first edition (CUES I). However, there were four substantive changes: addition of two new scales (Campus Morale and Quality of Teaching/Faculty-Student Relationships); norms were based upon a larger sample; the items that discriminated best among institutions were kept, while others were deleted; and new items, designed to keep pace with changes in collegiate environments, were added. Nault and Sedlacek (1970) found that CUES I and CUES II essentially measured the same things, with only the Propriety scale showing differences between the two forms.

Freshmen entering an institution may hold perceptions of the institution, but since incoming freshmen have had virtually no direct experience with the institution, these perceptions should more appropriately be viewed as expectations. Astin (1964), Berdie (1966,1968), Chapman and Sedlacek (1969), Lynch and Sedlacek (1971), Pace (1966) and Quay and Dole (1972) have all found that freshman expectations, as measured during an orientation or registration period by CUES, are significantly higher than freshman perceptions, as measured after at least one term at the institution, or from the perceptions of those already in attendance at the institution. Pace (1966) reports that entering freshmen tend to have unrealistic expectations about the college environment, resulting in extremely high scores on

the Community, Awareness, and Scholarship dimensions, and moderately high scores on the Practicality and Propriety dimensions.

Pace (1963) states that the perception of what is or is not characteristic of an institution may be related to a number of different variables. In summarizing research (1966) he asserts that differences have been found between men and women, faculty and students, freshmen and upperclassmen, and freshman expectations and upperclassmen perceptions. He asserts that no major differences were found between residents and commuters, students of different academic fields, successful and unsuccessful students, or sophomores and upperclassmen.

More recently, Lynch and Sedlacek (1969) investigated freshmen expectations at the University of Maryland and analyzed differences along the variables of sex, residence, SAT scores, high school rank, a number of attitudinal and personality measures, and college of enrollment (e.g., Education, Engineering , Business and Public Administration, and Arts and Sciences). They found some differences on sex, residence, and personality measures, but no significant differences on SAT scores, or high school rank. Additionally, "Expectations of the University generally did not differ as a function of the college in which a student was enrolled; however, freshmen entering the College of Business and Public Administration did anticipate a more practical, orderly emphasis than those in Arts and Sciences,"(p.5).

Similarly, Pace (1966) reports on data gathered at 11 institutions which looked at differential perceptions as a function of academic field. He asserts that the Practicality, Community, and Propriety scales show little difference across academic fields, but that to a small degree the Awareness, and to a larger degree, the Scholarship scales do show differences between academic fields. He recommends that the Scholarship scale should be calculated separately for major academic divisions at large universities with widely different curricula.

Berdie (1967) reported significant differences in expectations of incoming freshmen of different colleges of the University of Minnesota. However, despite

these differing expectations, he reported a significant Coefficient of Concordance (W), indicating a general similarity in expectations of the University, in regard to the relative emphasis of the five CUES scales. Generally it appears that students from different curricula hold reasonably similar perceptions of the institution as a whole.

The purpose of this study was to examine the expectations held by incoming freshmen at the University of Maryland, and to determine if there were any differences in the expectations held by incoming feshmen enrolled in different colleges of the University. A secondary purpose was to compare these expectations, as measured by CUES I with expections as measured by CUES II. The final purpose was to compare the expectations of 1971 freshmen with those of 1969 entering freshmen.

Method

Sample

Freshmen (N=934) attending orientation sessions at the University of Maryland during the summer of 1971 were administered the CUES. At any given administration, both CUES I and CUES II were administered, but they were distributed randomly (CUES I, N=467; CUES II, N=467). Freshmen were instructed to report what they expected the environment at the University would be like. Freshmen from 11 different colleges were sampled, but only those colleges with at least 30 respondents for a given form (CUES I or CUES II) were included in the analyses. This restriction resulted in only four ccolleges of the University being included in the analyses. The N's for each college for each form were:

CUES I		CUES II
N=252	Arts & Sciences	N=252
N=53	Business & Public Administration	N=53
N=48	Education	N=48
N=30	Engineering	N=30

Data Analyses

Following Pace's suggestion (Pace, 1963, p.37), two scoring systems were employed in analyzing the data; mean scores and 66+/33-. In the mean score

method one computes each individual's score on each of the five scales, and then computes a mean and standard deviation of the individual scores for each scale. The 66+/33- method is an opinion-poll type scoring technique. Each CUES item has a keyed response (True or False), and the percentage of respondents answering in the keyed direction is computed for each item. The score on a particular scale is based upon the number of items answered in the keyed direction by at least 66% of the respondents, minus the number of items answered in the keyed direction by fewer than 33% of the respondents. CUES I scores were converted to comparable CUES II scores. (A more detailed description of this scoring technique may be found in Pace, 1969).

For each scale of CUES I and CUES II a one-way analysis of variance was performed across college of enrollment, using the mean scores.

The mean scale scores of CUES I were compared with the mean scores of 1969 entering freshmen (see Nault and Sedlacek, 1970, p.8), using t-tests.

Additionally, using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W), the ranks of the CUES I and II scales scores (66+/33-method) were compared by college.

To compare CUES I and CUES II scores, two methods were employed. The ranks of the scale scores were compared using Spearman's rho, and confidence ranges, (Gelso and Sims, 1968) were computed for each scale score of both forms.

Results

Differences of expectation as measured by CUES I and CUES II

Table 1 indicates freshman expectations for each of the five scales of CUES I for each of the colleges and the total CUES I sample. Table 2 presents the same data for the five scales of CUES II.

In comparing the CUES I and CUES II scores, it can be seen that on both forms the Propriety scale had the lowest score, for both scoring methods. However, the other four scales show more variability. The 66+/33- method indicates that freshmen,

for all colleges, show the same pattern of expectations of the University on both CUES I and CUES II, namely that they expect the University to have its strongest emphases on the Awareness, Scholarship and Community dimensions, followed by the Practicality and Propriety dimensions. This pattern of expectations is characteristic of students at all institutions, no matter what type of institution and may reflect a national stereotype of college life (Pace, 1966). However, the mean score method produces a less well-defined pattern.

When scored by mean scores, both forms of CUES resulted in the Propriety scale again receiving the lowest scale for all colleges; but beyond that, differences rather than similarities are the rule. For CUES I, by mean scores, the Practicality scale received the highest score, followed by Awareness, Scholarship, Community and Propriety. However, for CUES II, the Awareness scale received the highest score, followed by Scholarship, Community, Practicality and Propriety. Thus, on CUES I Practicality was the highest score, while on CUES II it ranked fourth. Although the pattern of Awareness-Scholarship-Community revealed by the 66+/33- method was again present, the mean score method resulted in sharp differences between CUES I and CUES II on the Practicality scale. It would appear that CUES I and CUES II resulted in reasonably similar expectations, but that the mean score and 66+/33- scoring methods may result in some differences on CUES I, supporting Pace's suggestions (1963, p.37) to score CUES by both methods.

As a measure of the overall similarity of freshmen expectations, as measured by CUES I and CUES II, Spearman's rho was computed, using the ranks of the five scale scores, for the total sample of CUES I and CUES II. A rho of 1.00 ($p<.05$) was obtained by the 66+/33- method, and a rho of .40 ($p<.05$) was obtained by the mean score method.

Because CUES I scale scores are based upon a 30 item scale, while CUES II scale scores are based upon a 20 item scale, traditional psychometric comparisons between samples using different forms are not appropriate. Additionaly, the 66+/33-

method does not lend itself to traditional methods to compare groups. However, following the method of Gelso and Sims (1968), confidence ranges for the scores of each scale of both CUES I and CUES II were established. The lower limit was established by computing what the score would be if items less than one standard error above 66% (or 33%) had fallen below 66% (or 33%). The upper limit was established by computing what the score would be if the items less than one standard error below 66% (or 33%) had fallen above 66% (or 33%). If the confidence ranges established in this manner show no overlap, there is a "high degree of confidence that a real difference exists between the groups." (Gelso and Sims, 1968, p. 41).

Table 3 presents the scale scores and confidence ranges for the CUES I and CUES II total samples. Only the Propriety scale shows no overlap in confidence ranges between CUES I and CUES II, with the CUES II score on Propriety being higher than that of CUES I. This result is identical to that of Nault and Sedlacek (1970) who found only the Propriety scores of CUES I and CUES II to differ significantly. They also found the CUES II Propriety score to be higher than that of CUES I.

Differences in expectation among colleges

Students from Arts and Sciences, Business and Public Administration, Education, and Engineering did not differ significantly in their expectations of the University, as measured by CUES I (mean scores $p < .05$). Only the Practicality scale of CUES II showed a significant difference in the expectations of students of different colleges ($p < .05$, see Table 2). A post-hoc Scheffe´ comparison revealed that Engineering freshmen expected significantly more Practicality than Arts and Sciences freshmen ($p < .05$). Lynch and Sedlacek (1969) also found that only the Practicality scale showed any differences in expectation among colleges. Additionally Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W) revealed significant ($p < .05$) similarities in ranking of CUES scales by college. Thus, as measured by both CUES I and

CUES II, freshmen of different academic fields hold similar expectations of the University.

Differences between 1971 and 1969

Table 4 shows means, standard deviations and t's, comparing freshman expectations of 1971 with those of 1969 (see Nault and Sedlacek, 1970, p.8). The table shows that four of the five scales are significantly lower ($p<.05$) in 1971 than in 1969. Only the Scholarship scale shows no significant difference from 1969 freshman expectations.

Discussion

This study had three objectives: to compare CUES I and CUES II expectations; to compare the expectations of incoming freshmen of different colleges; and to compare 1969 and 1971 expectations.

CUES I and CUES II generally appear to measure the same things, which is to be expected, since the 20 items of each scale of CUES II are all taken from the original 30 items of each CUES I scale. However, it appears that the Propriety scales of CUES I and CUES II are measuring different things.

Additionally, the expectations of freshmen entering different colleges of the University, and therefore different curricula, are quite similar. Only on the Practicality scale of CUES II are significant differences found between different colleges, a finding much like that of Lynch and Sedlacek (1969). For prospective students, the sources of information about an institution: guidance counselors, media presentations and institutional printed materials, and friends attending the institution, seem to present a consistent picture of the institution, resulting in similar expectations. Perhaps a national stereotype of college life is operative.

The issue of current, as compared to past expectations presents some interest-

ing observations. The expectations of 1971 entering freshmen were significantly lower than those of freshmen who entered the University in 1969. On every scale except Scholarship the scale scores were lower in 1971. Not only are 1971 freshmen expectations lower than they were in 1969, but they are also lower than those of incoming freshmen reported in 1966 (Pace, 1966). Two possible hypotheses arise. Either freshmen of 1971 hold lower expectations (possibly more realistic) of what college life is like, or the CUES does not tap all of the relevant factors influencing a freshman's expectations. Neither CUES I nor CUES II, which was developed to keep abreast of changes and trends in higher education, contain items dealing with drugs, protests, student rights, birth control, the Indochina War, or racism. It would appear that omissions of this nature in 1971 virtually insure that the instrument will not fully measure the expectations that are held by incoming freshmen. In addition, Pace (1966) reports that average expectations of incoming freshmen on the Scholarship, Awareness, and Community scales are all above the 90th percentile, and at the 75th percentile on the Practicality and Propriety scales. However, the 1971 incoming freshmen scored (66+/33- method) at the 94th percentile on the Awareness scale, but on all other scales the scores ranged from the 15th to the 73rd percentile. It is unlikely that the 1969 and 1971 samples were systematically different since they were both randomly drawn from freshmen attending orientation.

Finally, the issue of scoring the CUES should be raised. Pace (1963) recommends against using only the mean scores method, and actually favors the 66+ (now 66+/33-) method. Tables 1 and 2 showed how different the obtained scores can be, using the two methods. However, in an apparent contradicition, Pace (1963, 1966, 1969) only provides normative data based upon the 66+ or 66+/33- scoring methods. It would be desirable for him to begin to also report normative data derived from the mean scores method.

It seems that CUES I and CUES II are measuring the same thing, and that unlike Berdie (1967), but like Lynch and Sedlacek (1969), incoming freshmen of different colleges of the University hold similar expections of the institution. Precisely what CUES I and II are measuring is, however, open to some question. The expectations of 1971 freshmen are significantly lower than those of 1969 freshmen, and do not fit Pace's (1966) assertion that incoming freshmen hold unrealistically high expectations.

Thus, at least at one school, the role of student personnel staff and programs in attempting to reduce the gap between perceptions and reality through orientation programs, counseling, student activities and related programs appears minimized. The mass media, through generally negative publicity about riots, financial problems, racial problems, etc. as well as friends and neighbors likely have shattered the image of ivy covered walls and studious discourse across a log.

Several new and emerging roles for student personnel workers seem possible and desirable. Rather than focusing on the broad aspects of what college life is all about, the focus can be on the diversity of life styles and specific orientation, counseling, and advisement, within that context. In other words, student personnel can move from a molar approach to a more molecular one. Second, it would seem that more time could be spent in direct and indirect support of academic programs; the primary business of a university. Teaching, academic advising, structuring learning environments and programs, and focusing on classroom activities seem warranted. Third, a role discussed but often not implemented (O'Neil, 1972), is that of a change agent. O'Neil found very few student personnel workers at the University engaged in such activity. That is, if the expectations and reality of the environment are in line, one might try to change the environment and hope to bring the perceptions along with the change. This will likely require much stronger

and likely more radical positions, backed up by expertise, taken by student personnel workers. Change is difficult and requires intense and sustained efforts (Alinsky, 1971).

It is likely that most student personnel workers will require training in one or all of these areas. This can be accomplished through staff development on the job and through curriculum revision in graduate programs.

References

Alinsky, S. *Rules for radicals*, New York: Random House, 1971.

Astin, A.W. Some characteristics of student bodies entering higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1964, 55,267-276.

Berdie, R.F. College expectations, experiences and perceptions. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1966, 7, 336-344.

Berdie, R.F. A university is a many-faceted thing. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 45, 768-755.

Berdie, R.F. Changes in university perceptions during the first two college years. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1968, 9, 85-89.

Chapman, T.H. and Sedlacek, W.E. Differences between student expectations and perceptions of the University of Maryland. *Counseling Center Research Report # 5-69*, University of Maryland, College Park, 1969.

Gelso, C.J. and Sims, D.M. Perceptions of a junior college environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1968, 9, 40-43.

Lynch, R.L. and Sedlacek, W.E. Freshman expectations of the University of Maryland. *Counseling Center Research Report # 3-69*, University of Maryland, College Park, 1969.

Lynch, R.L. and Sedlacek, W.E. Differences between student and student affairs staff perceptions of a university. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1971, 12, 173-176.

Nault, S.P. and Sedlacek, W.E. Differences between freshman expectations of the University of Maryland in 1968 and 1969. *Counseling Center Research Report # 15-70*, University of Maryland, College Park, 1970.

O'Neil, J.M. Towards an ethical philosophy of action for student personnel. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, University of Maryland, 1972.

Pace, C.R. *Preliminary Technical Manual, College and University Environment Scales*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Pace, C.R. *Comparisons of CUES Results from Different Groups of Reporters*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Pace, C.R. *Manual: College and University Environment Scales - edition II*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Quay, A.T. and Dole, A.A. Changes in community college perceptions before and after matriculation. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1972, 13, 120-125.

Table 1.

Freshmen Expectations of the University (CUES I) by College of Enrollment*

	(Practicality)			(Community)			(Awareness)			(Propriety)			(Scholarship)		
	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.
Arts & Sciences (N=252)	19	13.12	2.57	20	11.95	2.44	36	12.47	.38	8	10.00	2.21	27	12.31	2.86
Business & Public Admin. (N=53)	23	13.74	2.52	22	11.96	2.90	34	12.34	3.08	10	10.49	2.45	32	11.36	2.59
Education (N=48)	18	12.77	2.53	25	11.92	2.66	37	13.08	1.70	14	9.81	2.27	33	12.31	2.56
Engineering (N=30)	20	13.73	2.12	22	11.70	2.38	32	11.73	3.44	12	10.37	1.83	33	11.63	2.53
Total Sample (N=383)	18	13.21	2.53	21	11.93	2.53	34	12.43	2.52	9	10.07	2.23	28	12.12	2.78

* Scores for each scale computed by the 66+/33- method follow Pace's suggestion (1966) of converting CUES I scores to comparable CUES II scores.

Table 2.

Freshmen Expectations of the University (CUES II) by College of Enrollment

	Practicality			Community			Awareness			Propriety			Scholarship		
	66+/33-	Mean*	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.	66+/33-	Mean	S.D.
A & S N=152	19	9.76	2.48	19	10.18	3.47	34	14.39	3.87	9	6.24	2.97	27	11.91	3.90
BPA N=53	20	10.13	2.65	25	11.02	3.58	33	14.23	3.89	10	6.93	3.36	29	12.96	3.26
Educa. N=48	20	9.83	2.85	22	10.58	3.64	35	14.67	2.81	9	5.54	2.69	28	12.67	3.40
Engnrg. N=30	24	11.33	2.75	26	11.47	2.85	34	14.60	2.39	10	6.47	2.99	28	13.30	2.91
Total Sample N=383	19	9.94	2.60	21	10.44	3.48	34	14.42	3.65	12	6.26	3.00	29	12.26	3.71

* Means significantly different ($p < .05$) using F.

Table 3.

Scale Scores and Confidence Ranges for Total Samples* of CUES I and CUES II (66+/33- scoring method)

	Practicality 1		Community 2		Awareness 3		Propriety 4		Scholarship 5	
	Score	Conf. Range	Score	Conf. Range	Score	Conf. Range	Score	Conf. Range	Score	Conf. Range
CUES I (N=383)	18	17-20	21	20-21	34	33-35	9	8-10	28	28-30
CUES II (N=383)	19	19-20	21	19-22	34	33-35	12	11-13	29	28-30

* See Gelso and Sims (1968)

Table 4.

Mean Differences Between the University of Maryland 1969* and 1971 Expectations, as measured by CUES I

	1969 Expectations, N=644		1971 Expectations		t
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	(1969 vs 1971)
Practicality	17.96	3.17	13.21	2.53	24.50**
Community	21.43	4.56	11.93	2.53	38.82**
Awareness	19.60	4.16	12.43	2.52	31.32**
Propriety	24.15	4.68	10.07	2.23	58.30**
Scholarship	11.98	3.80	12.12	2.78	-.63

* From Nault and Sedlacek (1970)

** Significant at .05 level

APPENDIX A.

A Description of CUES*

1. Practicality: To what extent does the campus atmosphere emphasize the concrete and realistic rather than the abstract and speculative? A high score indicates that organization, system and procedure are important, as well as status and practical benefit. Also, order and supervision are characteristic, of the administration and of the classwork.

2. Community: Is the environment cohesive and supportive? Does a concern for group welfare and a feeling of group loyalty pervade the campus? High scores indicate a supportive and sympathetic environment; low scores suggest one where privacy is important and detachment prevalent.

3. Awareness: How much concern is there for self-understanding and identity? How much active interest is there in a wide range of esthetic forms? How pronounced is personal involvement with the world's problems and the condition of man?

4. Propriety: Decorum, politeness, consideration, thoughtfulness and caution are elements of this scale. A low score would indicate an atmosphere that is relatively demonstrative and assertive, more impulsive than cautious, more free-wheeling than polite and mannerly.

5. Scholarship: This scale reflects interest in scholarship, in academic achievement and competition for it. High scores indicate emphasis upon intellectual speculation, interest in ideas as ideas and in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

*Pace, 1966, pp. 1 & 2